

**From:** Mike Wade

**Sent:** Friday, February 20, 2004 2:59 PM

**To:** Dabbs, Paul

**Cc:** Guivetchi, Kamyar; Beutler, Lisa; Alex Hildebrand; Anisa Divine; Bill DuBois; Bill DuBois2; BJ Miller (BJ Miller); Brent Graham; Jim Snow; John Mills; Lloyd Fryer (Lloyd Fryer); Michele Dias; Mike Wade (Mike Wade); Nancy Pitigliano; Steve Shaffer; Todd Manley; Valerie Nera

**Subject:** January 30 Draft Water Plan Comments

Paul:

Attached are comments from the Bulletin 160 Ag Caucus on the January 30 Draft. In addition, we received input from Alex Hildebrand that was too late for full review by the Ag Caucus and still meet the February 20 deadline for comments. Nonetheless, Alex's thoughts need to be considered and are included below for your review.

Thank you.

Mike Wade

<< File: Final Comments 2-20-04.doc >>

Alex Hildebrand

There was agreement at the last AC meeting that Chapter 1 would not have any hard numbers in it, yet there is still a reference to a \$17 million cost figure.

There has been a lot of discussion about applied water versus water controlled and otherwise lost, ie. The Peter Gleick presentation about saving water by installing low-flow toilets. This strategy works fine on the coast but is already done in the Valley.

Chapter 1, Findings and Recommended Actions - urban areas use about the same amount of water as in the mid-1990's, should say APPLIED water. Also need to point out that much of the urban water is applied and not consumed and reused.

Need to clarify increase in food production per quantity of applied water.

Mike Wade

California Farm Water Coalition

Agricultural Water Management Council